

No. of Copies rec'd \_\_\_\_\_  
List A B C D E

~~EX PARTE OR LATE FILED~~

Before the  
**FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION**  
Washington, D.C. 20554

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

In the Matter of )  
 )  
Implementation of the Local )  
Competition Provisions in the )  
Telecommunications Act of 1996 )

CC Docket No. 96-98 ✓

RECEIVED

JUL 23 1996

**ERRATUM**


FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

Intermedia Communications, Inc., by and through its undersigned counsel, hereby respectfully submits this Erratum to add Exhibit A to its *Ex Parte* Statement filed in this proceeding on July 22, 1996. Exhibit A was inadvertently omitted from the *Ex Parte* Statement. The corrected document is attached.

Respectfully submitted,

**INTERMEDIA COMMUNICATIONS, INC.**

By:

  
Jonathan E. Canis  
Wendy I. Kirchick

**REED SMITH SHAW & McCLAY**  
1301 K Street, N.W.  
Suite 1100 - East Tower  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
(202) 414-9200  
(202) 414-9299 (facsimile)

Its Attorneys

No. of Copies rec'd 012  
List A B C D E

# REED SMITH SHAW & McCLAY

1301 K STREET, N.W.

SUITE 1100 - EAST TOWER

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3317

202-414-9200

JONATHAN E. CANIS  
202-414-9483

FAX 202-414-9299

PITTSBURGH, PA  
PHILADELPHIA, PA  
HARRISBURG, PA  
MCLEAN, VA  
PRINCETON, NJ  
NEW YORK, NY

July 22, 1996

RECEIVED

JUL 23 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
Office of SECRETARY

Mr. William F. Caton  
Acting Secretary  
Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M St., N.W., Room 222  
Washington, DC 20554


Re: Written Ex Parte Statement of Intermedia  
Communications Inc. in CC Docket 96-98

Dear Mr. Caton:

Intermedia Communications Inc. ("ICT"), by its undersigned counsel and pursuant to § 1.1206(a)(1) of the Commission's Rules, hereby respectfully submits this written *ex parte* statement in CC Docket No. 96-98. An original and two copies of the submission are provided.

Please direct any inquiries regarding the attached *ex parte* statement to the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Wendy I. Kirchick

WIK/nr  
Enclosures

cc: Stuart Kupinsky, (FCC) (Hand Delivery) Don Sussman (MCI) (Fax)  
Paul Gallant, (FCC) (FAX & Hand Delivery) James K. Smith (Ameritech) (Fax)  
Mary Brown (MCI) (Fax) International Transcription Services

**Before the  
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
Washington, D.C. 20554**

In the Matter of	)	
	)	
Implementation of the Local	)	CC Docket No. 96-98
Competition Provisions in the	)	
Telecommunications Act of 1996	)	

**INTERMEDIA COMMUNICATIONS, INC.  
EX PARTE STATEMENT CONCERNING INTERCONNECTION AT  
LEC NETWORK INTERCONNECTION DEVICES AND OTHER POINTS**

Pursuant to a request by Commission Staff, Intermedia Communications Inc. ("ICI") by its undersigned counsel, submits this written *ex parte* statement to address arguments made by MCI Communications Corporation ("MCI") and Ameritech in *ex parte* statements filed with the Commission on July 12, 1996 and July 15, 1996, respectively. This statement is submitted for the limited purpose of supporting the mandatory unbundling of incumbent local exchange carrier ("ILEC") network loop elements at all technically feasible points of aggregation and cross-connection, pursuant to § 251(c)(3) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 ("1996 Act").

**I. ICI AGREES WITH MCI THAT THE LOCAL LOOP MUST BE UNBUNDLED AT THE NETWORK INTERFACE DEVICE, AS WELL AS OTHER POINTS**

ICI fully endorses MCI's position, and concurs that the Network Interface Device is a segregable network element that is important to competitors, and that it is technically feasible for ILECs to offer interconnection at the NID as an unbundled network element. ICI also posits that the Ameritech response in fact demonstrates that

such interconnection at the NID is technically feasible, and effectively concedes that NID unbundling is mandated by the 1996 Act.

While both MCI and Ameritech have performed a considerable public service in providing significant technical detail concerning the type of NID interconnection that MCI has requested, ICI is concerned that the Commission adopt a broader and more inclusive set of interconnection requirements that are not bound by a static view of technology -- and certainly are not restricted to the few particular pieces of equipment that MCI and Ameritech have identified for a very limited interconnection scenario. Rather, ICI urges the Commission to give effect to the clear meaning of the 1996 Act, which requires loop unbundling and interconnection in a dynamic environment in which both ILECs and CLECs are free to configure their networks optimally using innovative technology as it becomes available.

ICI agrees with Ameritech that the "NID" should be considered as a generic point of interconnection, and should not be considered to represent a single technology or piece of equipment.<sup>1</sup> Indeed, while the NID interconnection application posited by MCI involves a non-intelligent or passive device,<sup>2</sup> other types of equipment could easily serve a similar function. For example, it is not uncommon now for ILECs to deploy fiber optic cable feeds off their SONET networks to large customer locations. In this case, an optical terminating line multiplexer or other type of terminating equipment may be deployed in the basement of a multitenant building to act as a "NID" that

---

1 Ameritech *ex parte* at 1.

2 MCI *ex parte* at 1.

terminates ILEC network plant on the trunk side and provides access to the customer's inside wire on the line side.

Similarly, in a multitenant building, if the NID is not located outside the building housing the customer, but instead is located near the customer's premises within the building, the Act requires the ILEC to unbundle the lateral and riser cable, as well as any concentration or cross-connection equipment located within the building. Such unbundling is discussed in additional detail below.

Moreover, while both MCI and Ameritech discussed only NID arrangements in a multitenant building scenario, interconnection with similar access devices is also necessary in multistructure environments, such as college campuses and industrial parks. In this type of arrangement, the ILEC network may terminate in a digital loop carrier arrangement, which will act as the NID to the customer-owned network serving the various buildings in the campus or park. In another configuration, the ILEC loop network may not end at the loop carrier, but may continue down the distribution cable to bring service to individual buildings within the campus or park. In that case, competitive carriers may wish to interconnect either at the loop carrier, or at the NIDs located at individual buildings on the campus. These variations will provide both ILECs and competitive carriers options to configure their networks optimally. They also will give rise to a variety of technically feasible interconnection points along the ILEC loop.

In short, depending on the equipment used and the configuration of the ILEC and CLEC networks, the type of interconnection that is technically feasible within the meaning of § 251(c)(3) of the 1996 Act will change considerably, and the

Commission's interconnection rules must be sufficiently broad to accommodate a variety of appropriate interconnection arrangements. ICI reiterates that the Commission should mandate that ILECs are required to offer as unbundled network elements all points of cross-connection and concentration along their local loops.

## **II. ILECS MUST UNBUNDLE LATERAL, RISER AND DISTRIBUTION CABLE AND CONDUIT WITHIN THEIR CONTROL**

ICI urges the Commission to look beyond the scenarios discussed in the MCI and Ameritech pleadings to consider other loop unbundling and interconnection arrangements that are equally important to the development of competitive local services markets. In particular, the MCI and Ameritech filings discuss interconnection scenarios in which the point of demarcation between the ILEC's network and the building-owners' inside wire is located outside the building, or in a "telco room" just inside the building. While such a configuration is common, it is by no means universal -- and the unbundling and interconnection requirements of the 1996 Act demand that other configurations be addressed as well.

Indeed, whether by state public service commission regulation or industry practice, ILECs often own and control the riser, lateral, feeder and distribution conduit and cable that brings service to individual tenant locations. In multitenant buildings it is not uncommon for the ILEC to own and control the riser and lateral conduit that brings service up to individual tenant premises within the building. For example, the Florida Public Service Commission defines the demarcation point between the LEC network

and inside wire as: "[In a] *single line/multi customer building* - within the customer's premises at a point easily accessed by the customer."<sup>3</sup>

Moreover, in states where the building owner has the right to determine the point of demarcation, several cases make clear that standard industry practice often results in the ILEC establishing demarcation points at individual tenant locations. For example, the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission in 1993 approved a settlement agreement involving US West and several property owners that established terms for "intra-building network cable." The provisions of that agreement state:

Intra-Premise Network Cable and Wire (IPNCAW) is the portion of the exchange access line circuit that commences at the Minimum Point of Entry (MPOE) up to and including the Standard Network Interface (NSI). It includes wiring enclosures, house and riser cable, the protector, 66 blocks, etc.

\* \* \*

In multi-tenant buildings (those housing multiple customers of record for USWC services), this IPNCAW extends from the MPOE to the Demarcation Point designed by the building or property owner, but in no case shall the IPNCAW extend beyond 12" or as close as is technically feasible within each customer's (tenant's) occupied space/unit.

\* \* \*

Where intrapremise network cable and wire currently exist Building owners can relocate the Demarcation Point . . . toward the MPOE from its present location at any time.

\* \* \*

Current building owners may relocate the Demarcation Point from the MPOE further within the premises, thereby extending regulated Company facilities (IPNCAW) further within the premises.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> Florida Public Service Commission, *Proposed Amendments of Rules 25-4.003 et cet.*, Docket No. 951283-TL, Order No. PSC-96-0250-FOF-TL (Feb. 21, 1996), at 35.

<sup>4</sup> *Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission, Complainant v. U S West Communications, Respondent*, Docket No. UT-920474 (Apr. 30, 1993), at 20-22.

A review of cases in other jurisdictions further illustrates that it has been a common industry practice for LECs to establish demarcation points at multiple tenant locations within multitenant buildings.<sup>5</sup>

Notably, in New York, NYNEX published a tariffed rate element called an "intrabuilding channel termination." This rate element represents an offering of riser and lateral conduit and cable on an unbundled basis, and illustrates that such subloop unbundling is technically feasible and entirely practicable. ICI attaches a copy of the tariffed intrabuilding channel termination offering as Appendix A.<sup>6</sup>

This precedent is not limited to state decisions, but is also reflected in the Commission's own inside wire rules and the rules of state commissions that have adopted the federal standard. The Commission's currently effective inside wire rules specifically accommodate industry practices that place multiple demarcation points at

---

<sup>5</sup> See, e.g., Public Utility Commission of Texas, *Complaint of GE Capital Rescom and Multitechnology Services, L.P., Against GTE Southwest Incorporated for Refusal to Relocate Network Demarcation Points*, Docket No. 14147 (Aug. 9, 1995) (GTE had installed multiple demarcation points throughout apartment building, which ultimately were moved to the MPOE); Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, *Elisabeth Ellenbogen v. Bell Atlantic-Pennsylvania, Inc.*, C-00945769 (Nov. 9, 1994) (Bell Atlantic had established demarcation points on each floor of an apartment building, which later were moved to MPOE).

<sup>6</sup> ICI notes that NYNEX's intrabuilding channel termination is referenced for the purpose of demonstrating that there are no technical or operational factors that militate against this form of subloop unbundling for conduit and cable within a multitenant building. Reference to the tariffed offering should not be construed as an endorsement of the rates established by NYNEX for the service -- ICI has not reviewed any cost support associated with the service, and takes no position on the reasonableness *vel non* of the tariffed rates.



locations near -- and up to 12 inches inside -- individual tenant premises within multitenant buildings.<sup>7</sup> This practice is followed by the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio ("PUCO"), which cites the Commission's policies with approval.<sup>8</sup>

In all of these cases, the ILEC local loop plant extends to the customer premises within a multitenant building, or to individual buildings within a campus or park setting. Points of aggregation or cross-connection in these configurations are segregable network elements which must be made available to competitive carriers on an unbundled basis.

### III. CONCLUSION

ICI respectfully requests that the Commission adopt network unbundling and interconnection rules in conformance with the discussion contained herein.

Respectfully submitted,



Jonathan E. Canis  
Wendy I. Kirchick  
Reed Smith Shaw & McClay  
1301 K Street, N.W.  
Suite 1100 East Tower  
Washington, DC 20005  
Telephone: (202) 414-9200

Counsel for

INTERMEDIA COMMUNICATIONS INC.

---

<sup>7</sup> 47 C.F.R. §§ 68.3(b)(1)-(2).

<sup>8</sup> Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, *The Commission's Investigation into the Detariffing of the Installation and Maintenance of Simple and Complex Inside Wire*, Case No. 86-927-TP-COI (Nov. 23, 1994), at 21.

## **ATTACHMENT A**

### **NYNEX'S TARIFFED INTRA BUILDING CHANNEL TERMINATION SERVICE**

New York Telephone Company

Section 7  
6th Revised Page 20  
Superseding 5th Revised Page 20

MILEAGE

D. MILEAGE ON LINES BETWEEN LOCATIONS (Cont'd)

(C)

2. Definition of Mileage Components

(D)

★ [ Intrabuilding Channel Charge: Denotes the charge associated with house cable used to provide channels between different floors in the same building. The demarcation point on each floor will be located not more than 10 feet within the customer's premises.

Central Office Loop Charge: Denotes the charge associated with that segment of a line which extends from the interface point on the subscriber's premises to the normal central office.

(N)

Issued July 17, 1989

Effective October 6, 1989

By Cornelia McDougald, General Attorney  
1095 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y. 10036

New York Telephone Company

Section 7  
24th Revised Page 22  
Superseding 20th and 22nd Revised Pages 22  
(23rd Revised Page 22 Pending)

MILEAGE

D. MILEAGE ON LINES BETWEEN LOCATIONS (Cont'd)

3. Rates and Charges for Mileage Components

The application of these rates is shown in D.4. following for other than intercept lines.

		<u>Monthly Rates</u>		<u>USOC</u>
		<u>Signal Grade*</u>	<u>Other</u>	
a.	Continuous Property Loop )	See Rate Schedule attached for rates and charges currently in effect.		
	Per 2-Wire Loop )			
	Per 4-Wire Loop )			
	Block Loop**			
	Per 2-Wire Loop	\$21.77	\$27.73	BKP2X (T)
	Per 4-Wire Loop	43.54	55.46	BKP4X (T)
	Central Office Loop** #			
	Per 2-Wire Loop	21.53	21.53	CON2X
	Per 4-Wire Loop	40.61	40.61	CON4X

		<u>Monthly Rate</u>	
★ [	b. Intrabuilding Channel Charge. )	See Rate Schedule attached	
	Per 2-Wire Termination )	for rates and charges	
	Per 4-Wire Termination )	currently in effect.	
	Installations Charge. )	(see Para. e. Following)	
	Per Termination )		NRCLF

\* The signal grade rate applies only to signal grade lines as defined in Section 16 of this Tariff.

\*\* In addition, feature function rate elements (Para. D.3.f.) apply to all "other than signal grade" Central Office and Block Loops.

# When connected to an interconnector's multiplexing node under Section 12, a Universal Service Element Charge and a Service Access Charge will apply as specified in Section 12, Paragraph I.2.(c). (C)

Effective, , under authority of the Public Service Commission, State of New York, Special Permission Order No T& , dated , Issued December 26, 1991. Effective January 31, 1992.

By Cornelia McDougald, General Attorney  
1095 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y. 10036

New York Telephone Company

Section 7  
 4th Revised Page 24  
 Superseding 3rd Revised Page 24

MILEAGED. MILEAGE ON LINES BETWEEN LOCATIONS (Cont'd)4. Lines (other than Intercept) Between Two Points

	<u>Intrabuilding Channel Charges</u>	<u>Central Office Loops</u>
a. Mileage Components		
☆ [ Between Points in the Same Building, between different floors		
Extensions on Individual and Centrex lines	1	0
Bridged Station lines on Individual, PBX and Centrex station lines	1	0
Tie Lines Between Centrex Services	0	0
Between CTX and PBX	0	1
Between PBX Services	2	0
All Other Lines and Channels, including Access Channels		
Per Termination	1	0

NOTE: A. Intrabuilding Channels will be provided only where existing spare capacity exists. The Company will not undertake to construct new facilities for the provision of channel service wholly within a single building.

(D)

Issued November 15, 1991.

Effective January 31, 1992.

By Cornelia McDougald, General Attorney  
 1095 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y. 10036

New York Telephone Company

Section 7  
4th Revised Page 68  
Superseding 1st and 3rd Revised Pages 68  
(2nd Revised Page 68 Cancelled)

MILEAGE

F. FLEXIBLE PRICING

(T)

Only the following mileage services are included:

Components: La Guardia Airport Lines  
Continuous Property Loop World Trade Center Lines

(C)

(C)

Intrabuilding Channel Charge

(C)

1. Mileage service rates may be reduced selectively and in varying amounts, so long as rates cover their relevant incremental costs.
2. Mileage service rates may be increased selectively and in varying amounts not to exceed 25 percent per year. Exception, intrabuilding channel charge rates may be increased selectively and in varying amounts not to exceed 5 percent per year. (T)  
(C)
3. The Company reserves the right to change the rates as described in 1. and 2. preceding at any time upon 10 days notice to the Public Service Commission by providing a revised Rate Schedule and appropriate cost support. The rates for this service are shown in the Rate Schedule appended as Page 3 of the Attachment to this Section 7. (C)  
(C)
4. Changes in mileage service rates will be effective coincident with the subscriber's bill date following the effective date of the change.
5. A rate will not be changed unless it has been in effect for at least 30 days.
6. Appropriate customer notification of mileage service rate changes will be made.
7. Mileage service rates may be changed in accordance with the provisions of 1. through 6. preceding in the New York Metropolitan LATA. (C)

(D)

Effective, \_\_\_\_\_, under authority of the Public Service Commission,  
State of New York, Special Permission Order No. T&T \_\_\_\_\_, dated \_\_\_\_\_,  
Issued December 26, 1991. Effective January 31, 1992.  
By Cornelia McDougald, General Attorney  
1095 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y. 10036

**RATE SCHEDULE**

NON-NEW YORK METRO LATA

(T)

Mileage  
(Rates effective January 10, 1992)

Mileage Components	<u>Monthly Rates</u>		<u>USOC</u>
	<u>Signal Grade*</u>	<u>Other Than Signal Grade</u>	
Continuous Property Loop			
Per 2-Wire Loop	\$ 3.85	\$ 3.85	CPL2X
Per 4-Wire Loop	7.70	7.70	CPL4X
★ [ Intrabuilding Channel Charge			
Per 2-Wire Termination	2.89	2.89	93G39
Per 4-Wire Termination	5.77	5.77	93G50

\* The signal grade rate applies only to signal grade lines as defined in  
P.S.C. No. 900 - Telephone, Section 16.

This Attachment to be filed following all pages that are a part of this section.

RATE SCHEDULE

NEW YORK METRO LATA

Mileage  
(Rates effective July 28, 1993)

Mileage Components	<u>Monthly Rates</u>		<u>USOC</u>
	<u>Signal Grade*</u>	<u>Other Than Signal Grade</u>	
Continuous Property Loop			
Per 2-Wire Loop	\$ 4.81	\$ 4.81	
Per 4-Wire Loop	9.63	9.63	(C)
★ [ Intrabuilding Channel Charge			
Per 2-Wire Termination	3.03	3.03	
Per 4-Wire Termination	6.06	6.06	

\* The signal grade rate applies only to signal grade lines as defined in P.S.C. No. 900 - Telephone, Section 16.

This Attachment to be filed following all pages that are a part of this section.